



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This being so, it amounts to a direct call to the mass of the people and their leaders in the countries concerned, being, as they now are, friendly to each other, to take steps betimes, so that no such wickedness as a preventable war may be secretly engineered. Such a warning, whether we count it wise and prudent or the reverse, is in fact a startling summons to the mass of the people to remember that the drift of foreign affairs and the foreign policy of their government are their immediate concern and cannot safely be left to the secret management of any class. In other words, the people themselves in every country must seek peace and ensue it.

In the face of such storm signals it is a plain patriotic duty to remove all causes of quarrel over national interests, and very sternly to suppress all incentives to any outburst of race passion which might sweep us headlong into the arbitrament of brute force. Every true patriot will do his utmost in his own country so to influence both rulers and people that the bloodshed, the waste, the miseries and horrors—in one word, the barbarism—of a European war may be averted. The very thought of the miseries it would bring in its train should help to make it impossible. But our best hope of ensuring an undisturbed international peace rests on the growing power in all countries of an educated democracy under educated leaders, who have learned the good lesson that war is a method of barbarism and a hateful thing, that it always brings sorrow and suffering, and seldom benefit, to the people unless it is fought to win or maintain their freedom, and that the reign of law should be as paramount in national and international affairs as in those of individual men.

Now all men are agreed that in civilized society individuals cannot be permitted to fight out their differences by private personal conflict. This would be a barbarous proceeding we say, and altogether out of date. Well, then, is it not high time for those governments, nations and empires which count themselves the leaders of civilization, to relegate this gospel of brute force to the limbo of things discarded as barbarous? Ought not the distinction between conduct which is civilized and conduct which is barbarous to be the same for nations as for individuals? Is it unreasonable to demand of all rulers and all governments claiming to be civilized this extension from individuals to nations of the reign of peace based upon the reign of law? Here in Europe it would simply mean that the great powers, which, as we cannot forget, call themselves Christian powers, should agree to recognize a common tribunal of arbitration as paramount to settle their own differences, as well as those of smaller nations. It would mean the ultimate appeal, in cases of difference, to a court of international law and equity, instead of the appeal to brute force. It would mean the spread of a spirit of good-will among the nations, instead of the spirit of rivalry, suspicion and antagonism. It would mean in every country the gradual lifting from the shoulders of the masses of the oppressive burden of bloated armaments, thus setting free a vast amount of national resources to be used for the prosperity and the happiness of the people at large.

Surely, then, on behalf of the multitudes, we may fairly demand of the great powers of Europe—for it is to these in particular we have to address our appeal—that, inasmuch as they claim to be civilized powers, to say

nothing of their claim to be Christian, they should enter into a genuine and *bona fide* concert to accept a common tribunal as the arbiter of any differences that may arise between one and another of them, and should freely recognize that the cynical, old-world, barbaric rule that the strongest bully shall prevail—*ut in grege taurus*—is a rule to be repudiated by every civilized nation or power.

The risks and obstacles in the way are still undoubtedly very formidable. There are the tone of opinion and the temper fostered by the great military autocracies. There is the dangerous growth of militarist sentiment among rival commercial communities. There is the mischievous influence of some portions of an anonymous press in every country, calling for increasing watchfulness, and deserving the execration of every true patriot; and there is the liability of democracies to be misled by this malignant influence, and to be swept away on the waves of passion, or panic or prejudice.

It is easy enough, and not without its uses, to point in calm weather to these rocks ahead. Great will be the service to humanity of those who render them innocuous. For this inestimable service we appeal to our rulers, our governments, our parliaments, our public press, our democratic leaders, our churches, Catholic and Protestant, and our schools for the young, in every country; and we look not least to the members of such a Congress as this so to educate public opinion and the public conscience in there respective countries, so to influence the spirit and policy of their governments, that the peace of the nations and the prosperity and happiness of those multitudes in every land who are the greatest sufferers from war may no longer be exposed to these dangerous rocks ahead.

Statesmanship vs. Battleship.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

Address at the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, May 20, 1908.

There is never a time when any cause is in so hopeful a condition as when it is between great triumphs and great tasks; when it is encouraged and fortified by the thought of victories behind it, and commanded by the thought of large duties before it. That is precisely where we stand. The advance of the cause in whose interests we are here has been, in the ten or dozen years since we first began to assemble here, something which the most optimistic of us in that first time could hardly have believed possible. We have been dreaming for so many decades about the Parliament of Man, the poets have been singing about it so long, that it is hard to realize that at last it is here in plain prose and that some of us outsiders were privileged to sit in the gallery there at The Hague for a little, last autumn, in the old Hall of Knights, and look down upon the Parliament of Man in actual operation. It is a wonderful international epoch in which we stand. If we had been told here at Mohonk ten years ago, in the days when Dr. Hale used to be making his resolute prophecies, that we should see to-day an international tribunal in the world, that we should see an international parliament practically assured, that we should see an international prize court, that we should see fifty-six treaties of arbitration already concluded between nations,—I say the most hopeful of us could hardly have believed that thing. Yet that is what has been realized up to the present year of grace.

What is this movement for which Mohonk has worked and which the Hague conferences are bringing to successful accomplishment? It is the supplanting of the system of war by the system of law. It is not to be done in a hurry. There will be many failures and delays; but if any people in the world are under obligation to patience as they watch the work of organizing the world, and participate in it, we are especially so bound, because no other nation is so familiar with the process of federation and its difficulties. We know how hard a thing it was to federate these thirteen States; we know that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was nearly wrecked more than once by the jealousies between the large and the small States. How much harder to bring into working order the world's fifty nations, with all their varieties of race, speech, religion, law, government and prejudice! It is a big job, my friends; but we are seeing it done.

We may properly rejoice that, whatever was done or was not done at The Hague, our American delegates stood there from first to last for the broadest and most advanced policies. We may rejoice, too, that, in the adoption of the Porter proposition, the modified Drago doctrine, relieving us at one stroke of half the fancied need for a great navy, the Hague Conference was worth to the United States a hundred times what it cost in money, time or effort.

The clear logic of the Hague conventions prescribes the lessening of the machinery for the arbitrament of international differences by battle corresponding to the increase and now so remarkable development of the machinery for their arbitrament by reason. We shall not see the one system entirely give way until the other is substantially preferred. But for any nation party to the Hague conventions, unless new dangers can be shown at the time, to be engaged in the actual increase of the machinery of war is to show infidelity to the clear logic, the clear command, of the Hague conventions; it shows at any rate a terrible blindness to the dominant and inspiring movement of our time in international affairs.

Now the men at The Hague clearly saw the importance of attending to the one great need as to the other, and they urged the nations to see to it that they studied the one as they worked upon the other. And it is a most hopeful thing that the nations are taking this study up in earnest. The Hague resolutions touching armaments will not be left academic, a mere pious aspiration; but, acting upon the mandate of the International Peace Congress at Munich last autumn, the International Peace Bureau at Berne, through its representatives in the different nations, is creating able commissions to study the next steps in this movement for the lessening of the machinery of battle commensurate with the development of the machinery of law. Among those who have accepted positions upon our American committees of ten are such eminent men in Congress as Theodore E. Burton and Samuel W. McCall, such eminent military experts as General Miles and General Wagner of Philadelphia, such eminent scholars and jurists as Judge Stiness, Charles S. Hamlin, President Warfield, and Dean Kirchwey of the Columbia University Law School.

The admiral of our fleet out in San Francisco harbor, to which fleet our president referred in his opening address, is reported to have said the other day a rather

startling thing. He said that we should be better off if we had "fewer statesmen and more battleships." Instead of demanding four battleships, the President should have demanded, and we should grant, five times four. Now we thank the admiral at any rate for pointing, in his reported remark, a most important antithesis — the antithesis between battleship and statesmanship. That is precisely the antithesis which we have to deal with at this juncture. The fewer statesmen, the more battleships; the more statesmen, the fewer battleships! What ship shall continue to sail the sea? which ship shall rule us, battleship or statesmanship? That is the question now proposed to America and to the world.

Let me remind you of two recent accomplishments of statesmanship. Just a month ago at Berlin — and a similar thing was done at St. Petersburg the next day affecting the Baltic — there was signed a treaty between the Foreign Secretary of Germany and the ambassadors or ministers of Great Britain, France, Sweden, Denmark and Holland, providing that the territory of all those states bordering on the North Sea should forever be respected. It should not be interfered with in case of war. If it was ever at any point menaced, then the nations party to the treaty must through their representatives come together and settle the matter in concert. When you consider the fear that there has been in the past that Holland might sometime be meddled with by Germany, and consider other things of that kind involved, how momentous this thing is! Yet it was hardly mentioned in our American newspapers, which at the same time were devoting columns to details of naval balls and sundry naval spectacles out on the Pacific coast. This treaty, the work of statesmanship, will do more to keep the peace between England and Germany than all the battleships in both their navies. Each of their new battleships indeed, utterly disproving the foolish dictum about big navies as peace preservers, is a new occasion of suspicion, menace and danger. Why are we so slow to learn the great lesson of our Canadian frontier, that it is when nations in mutual trust act like gentlemen that they are safe?

Let me remind you of something else which, almost forgotten apparently, has seemed to me of very great significance. There was an arbitration convention in Washington in 1904 — a convention of perhaps two hundred leading American international thinkers — presided over by the president of this Mohonk Conference at this hour. That arbitration convention, one of the largest — I think the most important — which has met in America, passed unanimously a resolution that in all arbitration treaties between the United States and foreign powers our government should refer to arbitration every question whatever, without exception. That resolution was passed by that great arbitration convention in 1904. It was offered by a committee of such men as Judge Gray, Mr. Foster and Mr. Straus, and it was passed unanimously. Now we want to live up to that brave and prophetic American action. We want to realize that high demand and help all the world to frame treaties on that principle. What is necessary to perfect the work in which we are engaged and in which the Hague conferences are engaged is that the territorial integrity of nations shall be guaranteed and that arbitration treaties shall extend their scope to the measure of that high de-

mand which was made by the Washington convention, over which Secretary Foster presided in 1904. That is statesmanship; and with the firm establishment of a few things in that line, the battleship will become a useless and impertinent thing. If the United States will take the leadership in insisting upon a few great things of this character, it will be leading in that for which the world waits.

Memorial of One Hundred and Forty-Four Members of the House of Commons on the Burden of Armaments.

[Following is the full text of the Memorial on Armaments signed by one hundred and forty-four members of the British Parliament and presented to the Prime Minister on July 30.]

Sir: An appeal was addressed last year to the late Prime Minister by a number of his supporters in the House of Commons in favor of a reduction in expenditure on armaments. The knowledge that there will be a renewed demand for an increase next year on the current rate of expenditure seems to justify us in now making a similar appeal to you. We make it in a spirit of sincere loyalty to you as our leader, and with an assured confidence that our views will receive a careful and sympathetic consideration.

In the Budget statement for the year 1906-07 you took a larger survey of our financial situation than is usual on these occasions, and you took it in the hope that it might impress upon the House, as it had impressed on you, a much needed lesson. You went back ten years for your starting-point. The population of the United Kingdom, which in the middle of 1896 was 39,600,000, had risen in the middle of 1906 to 43,600,000 — an increase of ten per cent. The national expenditure on imperial account had increased during the same period by £40,300,000, or thirty-nine per cent. Of this increase, as much as £21,000,000 was to be put down to the army and the navy. In 1896-97 the numbers voted for the army were 156,000 and the cost was £18,270,000. In 1906-07 the numbers voted were 204,000 and the cost was £29,796,000 — an increase in numbers of over thirty per cent and in cost of over sixty-three per cent. For the navy the numbers borne in 1896-97 were 91,500, and the cost was £22,170,000. In 1906-07 the numbers were 129,000, and the cost £31,869,000 — an increase in numbers of forty-one per cent and in cost of forty-three per cent. You also alluded to the cost of the Civil Service, and said in conclusion, with regard to the survey as a whole, that the figures appeared to you to call for no comment; they spoke with an eloquence that needed no rhetorical embroidery. In your opinion they made it the first and paramount duty of the Government to return to a more thrifty and economical administration.

This survey which we have ventured to recall to your mind gives us a large part of the case we now desire to present to you. For the rest we ground ourselves, first on the accepted principle that armaments depend upon policy, and secondly on the fact that since 1903 this country has been pursuing with preëminent success a policy of peace. Since that year we have, under the guidance both of Lord Lansdowne and Sir Edward Grey, established relations with foreign powers which have by

common consent removed many of the dangers with which we were previously confronted. The burden of our complaint is that there has been no corresponding reduction in expenditure on armaments.

The most difficult task with which the Government will have to deal in the immediate future is the apportionment of the resources of the nation to its several needs. This indeed is at all times the most difficult task of statesmanship. But the long rule of the Conservative party, their lavish expenditure on armaments, and their neglect of the domestic needs of the country have added enormously to it. Difficult, however, as it no doubt is, we are convinced that the welfare of the country demands that a resolute effort should be made to grapple with it in accordance with the traditional policy of the Liberal party, and that the permanent sources of our strength — the prosperity and contentment of our people — should no longer be sacrificed to the maintenance of military and naval establishments not clearly called for by the exigencies of our situation in the world.

In conclusion, we desire to acknowledge with gratitude the efforts that were made before and during the Hague Conference to induce other nations to consent to a reduction of armaments, and though our present appeal does not stand or fall with the success or failure of those efforts, we would respectfully urge that the present moment is eminently propitious for a renewal of them.

What Must Follow the Hague Conference.

William T. Stead, of London, writing on the above topic in a recent number of the *Independent*, says:

"The first great unfinished task of the Conference was the elaboration of a project of an International Court of Arbitral Justice. The idea was accepted by all the powers. The scheme for the constitution and procedure of the court was agreed to with equal unanimity, with one important exception. At the Conference it was impossible to obtain unanimity for any scheme for selecting judges. An irreconcilable difference appeared between advocates of the sovereign right of every state, regardless of its might or its area, to an equal voice in the selection of judges, and the advocates of what may be described as the principle of force, who maintained that the powers which dominated the world at present by virtue of their strength and wealth should be allowed corresponding dominance in the nomination of the judges of this world tribunal. The question as to how the judges should be elected was declared insoluble by the Conference, but it was relegated to the attention of the forty-four governments therein represented. The first duty which lies immediately before all the governments, and especially before the government of the United States, which took an honorable initiative at The Hague in proposing the constitution of the court, is to consider whether, with the inner light of the discussions of last year, it is possible for them to devise some scheme which would reconcile the opposing views. There is reason to believe that after the period of reflection which began when the Conference ended, Mr. Root and Dr. Barbosa, to mention two of the leading minds which have been engaged upon the consideration of this problem, may have discovered some method by which the idea of state sovereignty may be